

## To the Chair and Members of the Planning Committee

### APPEAL DECISIONS

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The purpose of this report is to inform members of appeal decisions received from the planning inspectorate. Copies of the relevant decision letters are attached for information.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

2. That the report together with the appeal decisions be noted.

#### WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR THE CITIZENS OF DONCASTER?

3. It demonstrates the ability applicants have to appeal against decisions of the Local Planning Authority and how those appeals have been assessed by the planning inspectorate.

#### BACKGROUND

4. Each decision has arisen from appeals made to the Planning Inspectorate.

#### OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5. It is helpful for the Planning Committee to be made aware of decisions made on appeals lodged against its decisions.

#### REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION

6. To make the public aware of these decisions.

#### IMPACT ON THE COUNCIL'S KEY OUTCOMES

7.

|  | <b>Outcomes</b>   | <b>Implications</b>            |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
|  | Working with our partners we will provide strong leadership and governance. | Demonstrating good governance. |

#### RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

8. N/A

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

9. Sections 288 and 289 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, provides that a decision of the Secretary of State or his Inspector may be challenged in the High Court. Broadly, a decision can only be challenged on one or more of the following grounds:
- a) a material breach of the Inquiries Procedure Rules;
  - b) a breach of principles of natural justice;
  - c) the Secretary of State or his Inspector in coming to his decision took into account matters which were irrelevant to that decision;
  - d) the Secretary of State or his Inspector in coming to his decision failed to take into account matters relevant to that decision;
  - e) the Secretary of State or his Inspector acted perversely in that no reasonable person in their position properly directing themselves on the relevant material, could have reached the conclusion he did;  
a material error of law.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

10. The Director of Financial Services has advised that there are no financial implications arising from the above decision.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS**

11. There are no Human Resource implications arising from the report.

## **TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS**

12. There are no Technology implications arising from the report

## **EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS**

13. There are no Equalities implications arising from the report.

## **CONSULTATION**

14. N/A

## **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

15. N/A

## **CONCLUSIONS**

16. Decisions on the under-mentioned applications have been notified as follows:-

| <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Application</b> | <b>Appeal</b> | <b>Ward</b> |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|

|              | <b>Description &amp; Location</b>  | <b>Decision</b>             |             |
|--------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------|
| 17/00110/OUT | Outline application for 2 detached dwellings to rear of 21 Park Drive following partial demolition of host property to provide access (Approval sought for access and layout) (Being resubmission of planning application 16/01749/OUT, refused on 20/10/2016) at 21 Park Drive, Sprotbrough, Doncaster, DN5 7LA | Appeal Dismissed 20/11/2017 | Sprotbrough |
| 17/01546/FUL | Erection of two bungalows with associated parking on former garage site at Land To Rear Of 18 Laburnum Road, Mexborough, S64 9RU,  | Appeal Dismissed 14/11/2017 | Mexborough  |

## **REPORT AUTHOR & CONTRIBUTORS**

Mr I Harris  
01302 734926

TSI Officer  
ian.harris@doncaster.gov.uk

**PETER DALE**  
**Director of Regeneration and Environment**